



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

laborers, and of bringing about a more enduring organization of industrial society.

University of Nebraska.

AMOS G. WARNER.

THE UNION-STATE: A LETTER TO OUR STATES-RIGHTS FRIEND.
By JOHN C. HURD, LL.D. Paper, pp. 131. New York: Van
Nostrand Company, 1890.

THERE seems to be no cessation of discussion involving the origin of National sovereignty, the growth of the Constitution and the powers of the several States, nor are great diversities of opinion wanting among present writers. And it must be conceded that recent discussions and investigations of scholars have brought about a clearer understanding of questions that hitherto have been disposed of by political dogma. The pamphlet now before me, as the title suggests, is a vigorous denial of the doctrine of States' Rights as a justification of secession. The burden of the argument consists (1) in showing that not one of the thirteen Colonies ever possessed an independent sovereignty, and consequently not one of the States could lay claim to it, and (2) in repudiating most of the theories offered as "defences" to the action of the Government in the restoration of the Union. To these ends the writer holds that each several State jurisdiction is actually dependent upon the "will and force of the thirteen Colonies together constituting a single possessor of sovereignty"; that the status of each disclaims that sovereignty could have been obtained otherwise than by united action. From these propositions as facts he derives the following conclusions: (1) that "A single possessor of the entire sum of sovereign powers had come into being in the person of thirteen States manifesting the will and force to hold such power as one national State within all of the territory known as the United States; (2) that, whether sovereign powers can or cannot, in theory, be divided, they were not so divided in the case of these States, July 4, 1776, and that, regarded as sovereign powers, those exercised in the

government of each single State, and those exercised in and for the whole country by a Congress, were derived from the will and force of all the States, existing as one integral sovereignty." This integral sovereignty the writer calls the Union-State.

In applying this theory to the circumstances of the War of Secession, it is claimed that when South Carolina determined to "resume her separate and equal place among nations," she proposed to resume that which had never existed. The act of secession was new and revolutionary. The writer holds that the disposal of the question must rest on fact and not on law. The essential part of the thesis, that sovereignty was obtained and possessed by a single power, is well sustained by numerous citations.

However, it is to be noted that the sovereignty won by a single power was *international* sovereignty, and that the relations of the several States to the National Government are not entirely disposed of by this fact. There were still thirteen organized units striving to organize the sovereignty which had already been won, but whose security was not yet assured. If the centrally-organized body, sustaining the international sovereignty, delegated to the newly-created States certain powers, it was done in accordance with the legitimate claims of these several *thirteen facts*, and the organization of the Federal Government based its polity on the existing laws and government of local units. The colonies were independent in their relations to each other, but not severally sovereign in the world of nations. In settling their relations to one another and to the central Government, it is useless to cite precedents, for there are no parallels of existing conditions in history. The time element must enter into all discussions of this nature. Sovereignty was a growth; there is a long time between its declaration and its final assurance. The unity of action and sympathy preceded the unity of organization. The Constitution is a growth, and its present status has been determined by an evolutionary process rather than by a

revolutionary act. Centralization is not a theory—it is a fact, the natural and inevitable result of our national growth. The several States are entitled to the powers granted them by developed and developing Constitutional rights. As to the “defences” of the action of the Federal Government in putting down rebellion, the argument that several sovereignty never existed is the true basis for such action, although other defences are entitled to more consideration than the writer inclines to give them. The monograph is a valuable contribution to the study of Constitutional History.

FRANK W. BLACKMAR.

University of Kansas.

CHARITY ORGANIZATION. By C. S. LOCH, Secretary to the London Charity Organization Society. Pp. iv., 106. London: Swan, Sonnenschein & Co., 1890.

THIS is a reprint, with but few changes, of Mr. Loch's paper entitled “De l'Organisation de l'Assistance” written for the *Congrès International d'Assistance*, held in Paris in July and August, 1889.

The charity organization movement is treated as a whole, frequent reference being made to English and American experience. The subject is discussed under the following heads: “Charity Organization a New Movement”; “The Lesson of the Poor-Law,” and “Principles and Methods of Charitable Relief.”

The author's account of the change which has taken place in the conception of the duty of the State to its citizens and of the citizens to the State is the most suggestive feature of the book. He claims that charity organization is a new social movement called forth by the spirit and necessity of the times. Its end is to bring about better social and charitable relations in the same community. Changed political conditions necessitate changes in social relations if the integrity of the State is to be preserved. Formerly the lower classes had no voice in the